

**QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY ON THE FINAL RFP FOR THE WEST VALLEY PHASE 1
DECOMMISSIONING – FACILITY DISPOSITION PROCUREMENT AND THE GOVERNMENT’S RESPONSES**

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
206.	Section C.3.0	<p>Permeable Treatment Wall (PTW) Management – CLIN 001 Pages C-21 – C-22</p> <p>Please provide the following documents which are cited as containing requirements for management of the PTW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PTW Operation and Maintenance Plan • Catchment Maintenance Plan 	<p>The PTW Operation and Maintenance Plan and Catchment Maintenance Plan are unavailable at this time. The Offerors should assume that PTW, and its soil catchment, monitoring annual costs are \$22,000.00. The contact end state for the “PTW Soil Containment” on Attachment C-2 will be changed from “Removed and soil disposed; Area restored after characterization completed” to “Operational (Passively draining contained soils; active transfer of collected liquids)”. DOE provided costs for PTW operations and maintenance of \$22,000 per year will be incorporated into Section L.5 (j) of the RFP, as well as the Summary of Cost Worksheets (Attachment L-8).</p>
207.	Page C-32, Section C.8.0 NRC-Licensed Disposal Area (NDA) - CLIN 001	<p>Scope requires that the north slope of the NDA be armored and protected to meet NRC NUREG-1623 and that the armoring tie into existing armor in Lagoon Road Creek and Erdman Brook. Please provide the design for the existing armoring and any available photos.</p>	<p>A design specification drawing of the needed NDA rip rap has been made available on the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site</p>
208.	Pages C-22, C-81, C-82, Section C.3.0 PTW Mgmt.; and Attachment C-2 Facility Description and Status	<p>Scope Section 3.0 says "Contractor shall maintain the soil catchment area in accordance with the Catchment Maintenance Plan." Please provide this plan.</p>	<p>The PTW Operation and Maintenance Plan and Catchment Maintenance Plan are unavailable at this time. The Offerors should assume that PTW, and its soil catchment, monitoring annual costs are \$22,000.00. The contact end state for the “PTW Soil Containment” on Attachment C-2 will be changed from “Removed and soil disposed; Area restored after characterization completed” to “Operational (Passively draining contained soils; active transfer of collected liquids)”. DOE provided costs for PTW operations and maintenance of \$22,000 per year will be incorporated into Section L.5 (j) of the RFP, as well as the Summary of Cost Worksheets (Attachment L-8).</p>
209.	Pages C-81, C-82, Attachment C-2	<p>Attachment C-2 addresses the "PTW Soil Containment" with the contract end state of, "Removed and soil disposed." Is the soil catchment the same as the PTW Soil Containment?</p>	<p>Yes. The PTW Operation and Maintenance Plan and Catchment Maintenance Plan are unavailable at this time. The Offerors should assume that PTW, and its soil catchment, monitoring annual costs are \$22,000.00. The contact end state for the “PTW Soil Containment” on Attachment C-2 will be changed from “Removed and soil disposed; Area restored after</p>

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
			characterization completed” to “Operational (Passively draining contained soils; active transfer of collected liquids)”. DOE provided costs for PTW operations and maintenance of \$22,000 per year will be incorporated into Section L.5 (j) of the RFP, as well as the Summary of Cost Worksheets (Attachment L-8).
210.	Page C-21, Section C.3.0 Permeable Treatment Wall (PTW) Management - CLIN 001	Scope requires operation of the PTW in accordance with the PTW Operation and Maintenance Plan. Please provide this plan.2	The PTW Operation and Maintenance Plan and Catchment Maintenance Plan are unavailable at this time. The Offerors should assume that PTW, and its soil catchment, monitoring annual costs are \$22,000.00. The contact end state for the “PTW Soil Containment” on Attachment C-2 will be changed from “Removed and soil disposed; Area restored after characterization completed” to “Operational (Passively draining contained soils; active transfer of collected liquids)”. DOE provided costs for PTW operations and maintenance of \$22,000 per year will be incorporated into Section L.5 (j) of the RFP, as well as the Summary of Cost Worksheets (Attachment L-8).
211.		Please provide an estimate of the mass, quantity and source terms for the spent fuel assembly hardware components requiring processing and storage in the Canister Interim Storage System?	Offerors should assume, strictly for the purposes of their proposals, that the Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) is limited to two thirty-gallon drums presently located in the Chemical Process Cell.
212.		Please identify the locations where legacy wastes are stored.	Legacy waste storage facilities are described in Attachment C-2 and can also be found in the WVDP Site Tour Book and Facility Description found at the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site.
213.		Please identify where wastes that are to remain in storage (orphaned wastes, TRU wastes, etc.) are currently located.	The WVDP TRU wastes are currently stored in the CPC-WSA, LSA 3 and 4, Vitrification vaults, and the LSA 2 hardstand. In general the smaller containers are inside facilities and the larger / heavier containers are stored outside.
214.		Please post a copy of all site permits currently in effect.	The requested documents are available in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site.
215.		Please identify the contents and current characterization of the nine tanks/vessels in the Liquid Waste Cell and the three tanks/vessels in the UPC?	The characteristics of the contents of the Liquid Waste Cell and Uranium Purification Cell (UPC) vessels have not been determined because of either accessibility issues or that liquid wastes are currently being added to the vessels. (The Attachment L-11 volume estimates are the expected volumes on June 30, 2011.) The UPC vessels have shown RCRA constituents (Cr, Ni and Hg) in past sampling however the offerors should assume that the onsite treatment/solidification of these liquid wastes results in 6,500 ft ³ of LLW.
216.		Please provide a copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	The requested documents are available in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
217.		Please provide the Sampling and Analysis Plan for the Waste Tank Farm (2008) referred to in the West Valley Decommissioning Plan.	The requested documents are available in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site.
218.		CLIN 002 discusses the need to relocate SNF debris and other HLW forms to the new HLW Storage Area. The RFP does not further define or provide characteristics of SNF debris and other HLW forms. Please provide information such as volume, physical properties, etc.	Offerors should assume, strictly for the purposes of their proposals, that the Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) is limited to two thirty-gallon drums presently located in the Chemical Process Cell. The two evacuated canisters are the same size as the 275 HLW canisters and they together constitute the assumed HLW. Other equipment and materials listed in Amendment 001 Attachment L-11 table that may have come in contact with HLW will need a waste determination by following the DOE O 435.1 Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) process. These equipment and materials are stored in facilities throughout the site as described in Table C-2. Offerors should assume strictly for the purposes of their proposals that the resultant outcome of these WIRs is that all of the equipment and materials are determined to be Low Level Waste. The aforementioned assumptions are strictly limited to the purpose of proposing offers and do not suggest a future action or decision.
219.		Specific quantities of liquids have been provided for 4 of the 15 tanks located in the main process building. Please provide the estimated volumes for the remaining 11 tanks. Also, please provide any radiological or chemical characterization information for the contents of all the tanks.	Amendment 001 revised Section C.6.1 to state “At least some trace amounts of liquids are expected to be present in all 15 tanks, but the four in the UPC and LWC vessels, are expected to contain a total of 26,000 gallons.” This means that attempts have been made to either drain the other 11 vessels and/or there is no reason to believe that contain significant quantities of liquids exist in them. The characteristics of the contents of the Liquid Waste Cell and Uranium Purification Cell (UPC) vessels have not been determined because of either accessibility issues or that liquid wastes are currently being added to the vessels. (The Attachment L-11 volume estimates are the expected volumes on June 30, 2011.) The UPC vessels have shown RCRA constituents (Cr, Ni and Hg) in past sampling however the offerors should assume that the onsite treatment/solidification of these liquid wastes results in 6,500 ft ³ of LLW.
220.	Attachment L-11 L-xx	Please clarify the current packaging, storage location, and proposed disposal pathway for the stored Legacy Wastes?	Waste storage areas are identified in Table C-2.
221.	Attachment L-11 L-xx	Of the 7,000 cubic feet of MLLW legacy waste in storage, what are the waste codes and the assigned treatments?	All legacy waste, including the MLLW, should be assumed to have been previously processed and needing no further treatment for disposal.
222.	Section 6 MPPB Demolition & Removal-	First Paragraph States: “After relocation of the HLW Canisters, the Contractor shall remove the Main Plant Process Building (MPPB) to the first floor slab (nominal 100 +/- 3-ft reference elevation). The first floor slab should remain intact to the greatest extent possible to control storm water and to prevent	DOE has no specific intention for any remaining grout.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
	CLIN 003 C-23	surface water infiltration into the subsurface cells and soil.” Is it DOE’s intent to leave the grout contained in certain cells (grout depth ranging from 6” to 28”), that are at the 100’ reference elevation (plus or minus 3’) or is the intent to remove the grout and liner from the base slab? Is it DOE’s intent to leave the cell floor grout in the cells below the 100’ reference location (i.e. LWC, GPC)?	
223.		Please clarify the status of the rail spur. The information provided at Stop 117 of the site tour indicates that “The rail spur is currently considered to be operable and can be used during the contract period.” But this discussion also acknowledges that only limited inspection has occurred due to extensive brush, that portions of the rail spur have been disconnected at the MPPB, and that the onsite spur is considered to be in usable condition based on one “good” tie out of every four. The tour also stated that work to place a new siding is incomplete but does not comment on the schedule for completion. Please confirm that we can assume availability of a fully operation rail spur with access restored all the way to the MPPB.	The rail spur is expected to be operable, not operational, at the contract starting point. The offeror should not assume the availability of a fully operation(al) rail spur with access restored all the way to the MPPB.
224.	Section L.4(b)	Requests that the “...Offeror shall provide an organization chart detailing functional elements down to the first tier supervisors with the number of personnel assigned to each supervisor.” Over the course of the contract, personnel levels and even organizational alignments are expected to vary significantly depending upon the nature of the work being performed at any given point in time. How does DOE want us to represent the personnel levels assigned to the individual supervisors? Should this be the staffing levels we expect at the beginning of the contract, recognizing that it will change significantly with time?	DOE intends to evaluate how the Offerors organization and business systems support implementation of the Technical Approach proposed and provide control and accountability for contract performance. DOE recommends that if the organizational structure changes throughout the contract period due to Technical Approaches (i.e. nature of the work) that the various organizational structures be provided.
225.	Attachment L-11	Attachment L-11 provides quantities of estimated volumes of stored waste as of June 30, 2011. Is the waste shipment ready? Can we assume that this waste is fully characterized and properly packaged according to the WAC for its respective disposition site and that it simply has not been shipped due to funding limitations?	Yes and yes.
226.		Observations made during the site tours revealed significant quantities of idle equipment, debris, stored materials, and waste containers in the process buildings that seemed inconsistent with the information provided in the RFP as to expected conditions at	Yes unless otherwise noted in Attachment L-11.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		contract award. Confirming the guidance provided at the site tour that the RFP has precedence over any site tour information or observations, can we assume that major portions of this material and waste will be dispositioned between now and contract end and that the conditions as presented in the RFP should form the basis for our costing assumptions?	
227.	In Attachment L-11	<p>In Attachment L-11, a new MPPB Beginning Condition Summary Synopsis has been provided as pages 2-12 of the attachment. But the previous version is also still included as pages 13-19 of the attachment and the two have very major discrepancies. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The original table showed the floor of the PMC to have 24” of grout on liner; the new table has no indication of grout and indicates that the floor is not fixed - The original table showed the walls of the PMC to be fixed; the new table indicates that they are not fixed - Substantially more equipment is listed in almost all areas <p>These types of discrepancies are widespread throughout the tables.</p> <p>In addition to the discrepancies, the footnotes in the new table create many more questions. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note 1 says “See window inspection report dated 10/6/10.” Where is that report? - Note 2 says “See tab “RIR based Ci inventory 2012” for curie inventory projection.” Where is this data? This would seem to imply that the table was built as an Excel spreadsheet with additional tabs that we cannot see because it was provided as a pdf. - Note 10 references a June 2011 inventory of remaining hazardous items. How are we to estimate costs based on values that will not be available until June 2011? <p>These discrepancies and additional questions created by the new</p>	<p>The table entitled "Main Plant Process Building - Summary of Beginning Condition" on pages 13 through 19 of Attachment L-11 in Amendment 001 was included by mistake. Offerors should disregard this table. The table entitled "MPPB Beginning Condition Summary Synopsis" on pages 2 through 12 of Attachment L-11 in Amendment 001 is the correct table. An amendment will be issued correcting this error.</p>

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		MPPB Beginning Condition Summary Synopsis have brought our estimating efforts to a virtual standstill. Substantial effort has already been expended developing our estimate based on the original Attachment L-11. The major differences that appear in the new table essentially negate a great deal of that effort. But more importantly, with both tables still included in Attachment L-11 and the substantial discrepancies between the two, which set of data are we to use as our basis for estimate? Should we assume that the original table should have been deleted and replaced in its entirety by the new table? Or, is the new table actually describing the current conditions, not those to anticipate at contract startup? How do we reconcile the major differences between the two?	
228.	Attachment L-11 (pages 2-12)	<p>Attachment L-11 (pages 2-12) is very confusing. Under the heading “piping,” what does the expression “as found” mean? Does that mean that piping will be present at contract award? If so, how much? Also, what does the expression “as is” mean? What makes it different from “as found”? Does it mean that piping is present? If so, how much?</p> <p>What does the expression “fixed by as-is paint” mean? How is that different from “as found Fixed”?</p> <p>Please also identify all the acronyms in the table in some manner. There are many that are unfamiliar.</p> <p>The footnotes also are confusing: Footnote 1 discusses a “window inspection report dated 10/6/10.” Please provide this report. Footnote 2 refers to “tab RIR based Ci Inventory 2012.” What does that mean and how do we access it? Footnote 7 states “Asbestos removal activity for ‘none’ is for accessible friable asbestos insulation material.” Does this mean that “none” does not mean no asbestos is present but that only insulation material has been removed? That asbestos tiles, etc., may still be present? If this is the case, please provide information on how much additional asbestos information is present. Footnote 9 states: Original paint and primer used in the MPPB</p>	<p>1) "Fixed by as is paint" represents Fixed Contamination areas, such as active aisles and stairs, or areas recently decontaminated, and painted during the Interim Endstate contract. "As found fixed" means, fixed contamination that, existed prior to the Interim Endstate contract due to historical operations.</p> <p>(2) The "WVDP Acronyms and Abbreviations Manual is available in the Documents Library of the West Valley Phase 1 Decommissioning – Facility Disposition web site.</p> <p>(3) The window inspection is available as Export Controlled Information (ECI). To request ECI, prospective Offerors shall follow the instructions on the Requesting Sensitive Information section of this web site.</p> <p>(4) The radiological inventory reports are available as Export Controlled Information (ECI). To request ECI, prospective Offerors shall follow the instructions on the Requesting Sensitive Information section of this web site.</p> <p>(5) None means no ACM is present, including non-friable ACM, such as floor tile.</p> <p>(6) NFS Paint Specifications for MPPB</p> <p>Concrete Wall and Ceiling Subject to Radiation</p>

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		<p>remains and may contain lead, asbestos, and potentially other hazardous metals. This is important. Please provide detailed and accurate information on these paints and primers and where they are located so we can accurately determine regulatory needs and disposal pathways.</p> <p>Footnote 10 refers to a “June 2011 inventory.” What does this mean?</p> <p>Footnote 13 states: “Measurement technique – Demolition checklist with documentation modified for each cell.” What does this mean? If DOE has used a demolition checklist, please provide it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phenoline 305 primer, Carboline 3340 Surfacer, 305 Finish Coat <p>Concrete Wall and Floor areas of Fuel Pool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carboline 300 surfacer, Phenoline 300 Orange, Phenoline 302, Phenoline 300 Finish White <p>Concrete Floors subject to Traffic and Radiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phenoline 305 primer, Phenoline 300 Orange, Phenoline 300 and 305 Finishes <p>Steel Surfaces subject to Radiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phenoline 305 primer and finish <p>Acid resistant paint for concrete surfaces subject to minor/no radiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherwin Williams chemical & moisture resisting enamel, or equivalent <p>Acid resistant paint for steel surfaces subject to minor/no radiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherwin Williams Red Lead Primer B 69N11/Sherwin Williams Chemical & moisture resisting enamel <p>General Purpose Paint for Structural Steel in the FRS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. C. Horn Holztite <p>General Purpose Paint for Steel Surfaces subject to minor/no radiation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherwin-Williams KEM A & A Epoxy Enamel <p>Concrete Sealer in General Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherwin-Williams Loxon Masonry Surfacer & Sherwin-Williams Loxon Masonry Paint (finish coat) <p>Organic Resistant Paint for Steel/Concrete</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sherwin-Williams KEM Cati enamel and Sherwin-Williams Grip Clad primer <p>(7) It means that by June 2011, an inventory of remaining items will have been compiled by DOE.</p>

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
			(8) The statement means that in documenting completion of work in each cell the Interim Endstate contractor will compile a checklist documenting and addressing each cell's particular requirements. The checklists will be created and completed by June 2011 however are presently unavailable.
229.	Attachment C-2, page C-39	Attachment C-2, page C-39, states that the contract starting point for the MPPB is "Decontaminated and deactivated with the exception of those systems required to safely maintain the HLW Interim Storage Facility." Attachment L-11 indicates that a great deal of equipment, piping, and other systems will be in place at the contract starting point. These two attachments appear to be in conflict. Please clarify which is correct.	The MPPB contract starting point in Attachment C-2 will be revised to state "Decontaminated with some equipment, piping, and other systems in place".
230.		<p>In the revised Attachment C-2, Facility Description and Status, the PWS entered in the Applicable Performance Work Statement Section appears to conflict with the PWS in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction and Demolition Debris Landfill (CDDL) is assigned to C.6.6 BOS Facility Decommissioning, while the Contract End State is no further action beyond maintenance. Should this facility be assigned to C.2.0, Site Operations, Maintenance, and Utilities since no decommissioning is required? • Rail Spur, Meteorological Tower, Security Gatehouse and Fences, Live Fire Range, and Rail Packaging and Staging Area, are assigned to C.6.6 BOS Facility Decommissioning while the Contract End State is operational. Should these facilities be assigned to C.2.0, Site Operations, Maintenance, and Utilities since no decommissioning is required? • Dams and Reservoirs (Lakes) are assigned to C.6.6 BOS Facility Decommissioning while the Contract End State is Operational and these facilities are specifically addressed in the scope of C.2.0, Site Operations, Maintenance, and Utilities. Should these facilities be assigned to C.2.0, Site Operations, Maintenance, and Utilities since no decommissioning is required? 	The Construction and Demolition Debris Landfill (CDDL), Rail Spur, Meteorological Tower, Security Gatehouse and Fences, Live Fire Range, and Rail Packaging and Staging Area , Dams and Reservoirs (Lakes) and the Wells Purge Water Storage Locations and Monitoring Wells/Stations will be reassigned to C.2.0, Site Operations, Maintenance, and Utilities in Attachment C-2.

No.	Final RFP Section	Industry Question/Comment	Government Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wells Purge Water Storage Locations and Monitoring Wells/Stations are assigned to C.6.6 BOS Facility Decommissioning while the Contract End State is Operable. Should these facilities be assigned to C.1.1.1.1, Environment, since they support the environmental monitoring program and no decommissioning is required? 	
231.		Of the 10,000 gallons noted as the waste volume starting condition for Tank 8D-4 in Section L Attachment 11, what volume of the 10,000 gallons is known or estimated to be sludge?	The estimated volume of sludge in Tank 8D-4 is 1,500 gallons.
232.		Can the certified EVMS system of a parent entity be substituted to meet the new entity EVMS certification requirement for a newly formed LLC? Also could the contractor adopt the incumbent's EVMS System Description to meet the EVMS certification requirement?	No, an EVMS Certification is done on the system for a specific contractor on a specific contract. The EVMS Certification of the parent company cannot be substituted for this contract. The incumbent's EVMS System Description could be adopted and submitted however it will still require the equivalent DOE certification.
233.		Question and Answer set #3 included questions 138-175 and set #4 included questions 178-205. What are questions 176-177 and did they inadvertently get left off one of these two response sets?	This is a numbering error. No questions were skipped.
234.	Section L, Attachment L-4	Attachment L-4, Part A states "Part A – General Information and Description of Services (limited to 5 pages)." Attachment L-4, Part B states "Part B – Problems Encountered During Performance (no page limitation)." Please confirm that Part A is limited to 5 pages and Part B has no page limitation.	This is correct.